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Abstract

Meeting minutes of the IEEE 802.11be MAC ad hoc group

**11/11/2019 – AM1 session**

Chairman: Jeongki Kim

Secretary: Liwen Chu

At 08:00am the chairman calls the meeting to order.

The Chairman informs the ad hoc group about the IEEE patent policy.

The chairman calls for essential patents. Nobody speaks up.

The chairman asks for approval of the meeting agenda in 11-19/2001r0.

Q: if the deferred Straw polls can’t be finished in this session, what should be done the unfinished straw polls?

A: complete all the backlogged documents, then continues with the new submissions

The agenda is approved by unanimous consent.

1. **11-19/0773r7 “Multi-link Operation Framework” (Po-kai Huang)**

Straw Poll 4: Do you support that a multi-link logical entity can indicate capability to support exchanging frames simultaneously on a set of affiliated STAs?

C: Multi-link logical entity is not agreed, it should be first agreed of multi-link logical entity.

A: multiple contributions have entity concept. It is not good to delay the straw polls per undefined multi-link logical entity.

C: what is the meaning of exchange: exchange is between two logical entity, exchange is between STAs afflicicated with multi-link entity.

A: announce the capability indication.

C: clarify the straw poll to add to another multi-link logical entity at the end of straw poll.

A: agree to add the text.

C: add the note that the name of multi-link logical entity can be changed.

A: agree to add the note.

C: which one is preferred: do frame work discussion first then do the other straw polls or add the note for each straw poll?

A: the group agreed to change the agenda to discuss the framework first.

1. **11-19/1855r0 “802.1AX Overview” (Osama Aboul-Magd)**

The document is about 802.1ax overview. No specific 11be architecture is proposed. Recommend to use as many of 802.1ax compoents for modelling 802.11be multi-link related work.

C: .1ax can be used since it for ethernet. Define entity to present to DS. It seems there is no conflict with multi-link entity.

A: generally agreed. Just to make to reuse .1ax as many as possible.

C: gree to reuse the existing one. However we should look at what we want to achieve: throughput, latency. .1ax archetexture assumes that BA is in MAC of each STA. But we may want some BA functionality to be in higher layer MAC of multiple STAs.

A: 802.11 defines many higher layer MAC e.g. HCCA, mesh.

C: .1ax allows one link 802.11 and another link ethernet.

A: propose to reuse .1ax as many as possible.

C: for packet level operation, we need to change both lower MAC and higher MAC.

A: this presentation is just for discussion.

C: more links may have different IP interfaces which is not covered by .1ax.

Straw Poll: Do you agree to make use of relevant 802.1AX components for 11be MLA discussion**?**

C: not clear about .1ax components. Look detail before agreeing the straw poll.

A: the straw poll just talks about .1ax.

C: similar comment. Not clear about relevant 802.1AX components.

A: not take .1ax as it is. Just look at whether and which .1ax components are relavent to .11be.

C: the straw poll assume that we have to aware of what .1ax is done. Shouldn’t do anything before knowing .1ax.

A:

C: two more presentations about architecture.

C: the straw poll is useful. Some components can be resued.

C: replace components with concepts.

A: agreed to change to straw poll to “Do you agree to make use of relevant 802.1AX concepts for 11be MLA discussion”.

Straw Poll result:

Y:22 N:1 A: many.

C: ask Ming to present the related documents and make progress.

A: the group agree to change the agenda to present 11-19/1940

1. **11-19/1940r1 “Multi-link Framework” (Ming Gang)**

Claim that One STA does not belong to multi-link, Try to reuse the existing architectures, do not touch any related operation.

C: slide 8, comment about transparent option. The difference with multi-lin entity: 1, more than one 2, name.

A: agreed.

C: question about more than one. One STA can’t switch between links?

A: it can operate in multiple bands at same time.

C: two carification questions: one MAC one MAC SAP. Do you allow two MAC addresses as AP side.?

A: we don’t touch address issue. Open to discuss.

C: one SAP MAC address (to LLC), multiple link MAC addresses are possible. Differentiate SAP address and link address.

A: open to further discussion.

C: Do you allow multiple-link dvice to have one working link.

A: we can discuss further ofr this case. But for definition we want to idisallow single link device to be named as multiple link device.

C: non-transparent case.

A: to the uplayer have multiple MAC addresses.

C: MAC address usage should belong to architecture.

A: depend on the architecture definition.

C: what is tunable single band STA.

A: for product, these two types of devices exist.

C: there may be some single link STA to have some functionality of multi-link device.

C: expct to have single link STA to be multi-link device for enhancement.

.

1. **11-19/0773r7 “Multi-link Operation Framework” (Po-kai Huang)**

Straw Poll 4: Do you support that a multi-link logical entity\* can indicate capability to support exchanging frames simultaneously on a set of affiliated STAs to another multi-link logical entity\*?

NOTE\* – the name and definition of terminology is TBD

Straw Poll result:

Y:32, N: 4, A: 29

Chair asks if there are any other business. No requests.

The meeting is adjurn.